DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 421 781 EA 029 188

AUTHOR Salvaterra, Mary E.; Adams, Dom C.
TITLE Implementing Block Scheduling: A Concern-Based Model of Change.
PUB DATE 1998-04-00
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Diego, CA, April 13-17, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Behavior; *Block Scheduling; *Change Strategies; High Schools; Interviews; *Leadership Responsibility; Models; Planning; *Principals; Program Implementation; School Culture; *Teacher Response

ABSTRACT

A study focused primarily on building-level leadership by observing how principals in 12 high schools (11 public and 1 Catholic) engaged in planning a structural change from a traditional schedule with 45-minute periods to the 90-minute periods of a block schedule. Using a concerns-based model of change, principals' behaviors and teachers' reactions are discussed, as teachers move through phases of the change model. Structured interviews were used to gather information from all 12 principals and 4 to 6 teachers in each restructuring school. Stages include awareness of the innovation, information gathering, personal concerns, management and control, consequences (evaluation of effects on student learning), collaboration with colleagues, and refocusing and acceptance. The change process is different for every teacher. Teachers highly committed to a change may move quickly to the refocusing stage, while reluctant teachers may languish a while in the personal or management stages. Effective implementation of change also depends on a principal's ability to foster conditions characteristic of healthy schools. Effective principals provide continuous communication of goals and ongoing feedback, identify teachers' needs and concerns in each phase, and target resources accordingly. Where leadership is shared between principals and teachers, effective change is more likely. (Contains 17 references.) (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 421 781

Implementing Block Scheduling: A Concern-Based Model of Change

Mary E. Salvaterra
Department of Graduate Education
Marywood University
Scranton, PA 18509
salvaterra@mfi.marywood.edu

Don C. Adams
Education Department
Bucknell University
Lewisburg, PA 17837
donadams@bucknell.edu

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Salvaterra
D. Adams
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Paper presented at annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) in San Diego, April 1998.

EA 029 188

Abstract

This study focuses primarily on building level leadership as principals engage in planning for a structural change that has become extraordinarily visible in the last five years, that is, the change from a traditional schedule with 45 minute periods to the 90 minute periods of a block schedule. Using a concerns-based model of change, principals' behaviors and teachers' reactions are discussed as teachers moved through the stages of the change model. Reflections on principals' behaviors which led to effective or ineffective implementation of block schedules are presented.

Implementing Block Scheduling: A Concern-Based Model of Change

Introduction

Schools, as organizations that are subject to the pressures of many environmental influences such as parental wishes and the changing needs of society, are dynamic changing organizations. Sometimes the changes that occur in a school can be described as evolutionary, that is, the changes evolve gradually over a period of many years and are often unplanned (Hanson, 1996). An example of a gradual change is the development of a school culture. Over a period of years schools often develop a set of beliefs which guide essential decisions such as personnel selection and resource allocation. This set of beliefs that becomes a core part of the school culture represents a change that is gradual and is a reflection of the cumulative effects of many influences both internal and external to the school.

As these gradual changes continue to occur in schools, other changes which are directed and planned are also occurring. Planned changes differ from longer evolutionary changes in that a planned change has an individual or individuals leading the change and there is "a conscious and deliberate attempt to manage events so that the outcome is redirected by design to some predetermined end" (Hanson, 1996, p. 284). Planned changes generally meet with resistance in the initial stages of implementation.

Planning educational changes to reach some predetermined end in schools has been a visible practice for the past century. From the NEA Committee of Ten's attempt to provide direction for public education in the last decade of the nineteenth century, to the Progressive movements of the first half of the twentieth century, to the technological initiatives of the current day, planned change has become a visible practice in basic education. Visibility of changes due to the proliferation of educational journals, professional conferences, staff development opportunities, and an increased national interest in education, has created an environment where schools are increasingly expected to change to reflect what is considered to be the best educational practice of the time.

In an environment of expected change, leadership must emerge if pedagogical changes are to occur. Although leadership in schools is often viewed on a systemic basis with leadership concentrated in the central office, authors such as Levine and Cooper (1989) emphasize that the individual building level is the site where leadership is critical. Therefore, the role of the principal, as leader, is central to the process of planned pedagogical change. The emphasis on the principal as leader is not to deny the importance of central office administrators as catalysts and supporters of change. The roles of catalyst and supporter are essential in the change process. However, it is principals who are on-site and have daily opportunities and responsibilities for supporting teachers, who are directly responsible for implementing pedagogical changes and upon whom depends the success of change.

The authors of this study acknowledge the important role of principals in the process of educational change. It is for this reason that this study focuses on building level leadership

as principals engage in planning for a structural change that has become highly visible in the last five years, that is, the change from a traditional schedule with 45 minute periods to the 90 minute periods of a block schedule.

Block Scheduling

Block scheduling, that is, the restructuring of time within the school day to create longer instructional blocks of time has increased in popularity during the last five years. Recent estimates indicate that as many as 50% of the school systems within the United States have now implemented some kind of block scheduling within their high schools Movement toward creating longer blocks of instructional time has occurred for many reasons. These reasons are now well documented and include creating increased opportunities for (1) integrated learning among subject areas, (2) meeting the individual needs of students, (3) engaging students in critical thinking through a focus on in-depth and authentic learning activities, (4) collaborative learning among students, and (5) whole-task completion within the framework of a single period (Adams & Salvaterra, 1997; Canady, 1995; Carroll, 1994; Salvaterra & Adams, 1996).

The purpose of this study, however, is not to promote or debate the advantages of block scheduling. Rather, this study explores the process by which 12 different high school staffs have changed to block scheduling as a potential method of improving teaching and learning within their schools.

Organization/Theoretical Framework

The concept of planned change infers that resistance toward a change will be minimized because a rational process is used to implement the change. However, any change which creates a deviation from established patterns of behavior will create resistance. Therefore any change, such as block scheduling, which creates the need for teachers to restructure the way they organize and teach lessons, has the potential to raise concerns which lead to resistance. It is the concerns of teachers with respect to educational innovations that gave rise to a theory of organizational change known as "concerns theory" (Hall & Hord, 1987). Concerns theory is based on the idea that as teachers become more invested in their work, concerns shift from issues that are focused on personal needs to issues that involve the welfare of students (Fuller, 1969). Initially much of the work with respect to concerns theory was done using novice teachers as they entered and progressed through their initial years in the profession. However, as the body of investigations involving concerns theory progressed, "a set of concerns common to most innovations and to the change process in general" was developed (Hall & Hord, 1987, p. 58). This set of concerns is illustrated by the seven stage model presented in Table 1 (Hall & Hord, 1987, p. 60).

Table 1
Seven Stage Concerns Model of Change

Stage	What is happening at the stage
Awareness	An awareness of the possibility of change occurs.
Informational	Information about the change is gathered.
Personal	Personal concerns with the change emerge.
Management	The focus is on managing and organizing the change.
Consequence	The effects on students and learning are a major concern.

Collaboration	Working together to make the change effective is paramount.
Refocusing	Refining and searching for new alternatives occurs.

In the preceding concerns-based model, teachers may have concerns simultaneously at several different stages. Teachers also generally shift from the stages focusing on awareness, information, and personal needs to the stages emphasizing student outcomes and making the innovation work as involvement with the innovation extends over a longer period of time (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993). It is this concerns-based theory of change that will be used as the organizational framework for this study.

Leadership Behavior in the Change Process

In addition to the process of change as imbedded in the concerns-based theory of change, a major focus of this study is the effect administrator behavior has in the process of changing to a block schedule. The characteristics of leadership behavior that were investigated are behaviors that are considered essential components of healthy organizations. These include keeping teachers focused on the goals of the innovation, the ability to communicate effectively, resource distribution and utilization, the ability to create new procedures or adapt old ones as part of a broader problem solving process, and optimal distribution of power in the decision-making process (Miles, 1965). These four components were used as indicators that effective implementation of the change to a block schedule was occurring.

Sample

Twelve high schools were used as the sample for this study. Two of the high schools were in their fifth year of block scheduling, two schools were their third year, three schools were in their second year, three schools were their first year, and two schools, who had studied block scheduling for more than two years, had not implemented block scheduling at the point in time at which the study was conducted. Of the twelve schools, 11 were public schools and one was a Catholic high school. Table 2 lists the student population, grade configuration, and population density of the sample schools.

Table 2
Sample of High Schools

School	Configuration	Student Pop	Pop. Density	Years in Block Scheduling
A	9-12	1000	urban	1
B	9-12	400	urban	5
C	9-12	900	rural/suburban	3
D	9-12	900	rural/suburban	1
E	10-12	1500	rural/suburban	2
F	9-12	1000	rural	1
G	7-12	500	rural	2
H	7-12	450	rural	5
I	9-12	450	rural	0
J	9-12	500	small town	0
K	9-12	800	small town	3
L	9-12	600	small town	2

Data Collection

A structured interview protocol was developed to ensure that consistency of information was gathered from all participants. Principals from each of the participating schools were asked to identify 4 to 6 teachers who represented a diversity of views with regard to the block schedule at the point of implementation. At the beginning of each interview session the researchers established subjects' current level of support for the change and their level of support at the beginning of the change process. The diversity of views in each school is expressed by the continuum listed below.

<--->

actively resisted the change — actively embraced the change

After identification of the teachers, interviews of 30 to 45 minutes in length were held with each of the identified teachers and the building level administrator. In two of the schools, due to availability of subjects, focus group interviews, as opposed to individual interviews, were held with teams of teachers. Each focus group contained four to five teachers. Following all interviews detailed transcriptions of comments were compiled. Comments made by each of the subjects with respect to each of the targeted characteristics of organizational health and the stages of concern in the concerns-based change model were then identified. The following discussion synthesizes the information obtained from the structured interviews and reflects upon administrator behaviors that promoted effective implementation of the block schedule.

Discussion

Awareness

In the initial stage of the concerns-based change model, awareness, teachers first become cognizant that an innovation exists in the environment which may alter the status quo. With respect to the study schools the ways teachers became aware of block scheduling differed from one school to another. In nine of the schools a general sense of awareness began with the principal indicating that "our school can be providing a better education for students." Principals emphasized this point by indicating to teachers that change was needed in the way instruction was delivered. This approach is summarized by the words of one school leader who stated:

> And I remember an opening faculty meeting right after Labor Day ... when I pretty much sent the message, "We're going to change, we're going to do something, the status quo is not an option...and then more things began to fall into place.

The status quo was interpreted by teachers in the study schools as meaning teaching styles lacked vitality, that teachers tended to rely mainly on lectures rather than group work, discussions, or hands-on projects. One teacher, who revealed that the principal created awareness of her need to improve instruction, stated:

> The initial concept came from him [Principal] not as, "OK, this is what we're going to do, but more subtly in the way in which he began to speak to people such as department chairs, just opening up the possibility, "This is a way to change the

> status quo, what is your reaction to it?" And...it got everyone interested before we were told, "This is what you are doing."

Conversations with other teachers indicated that although the principal was responsible for creating awareness of the change through both oral and written communications with the professional staff, teachers had already come to a realization that their effectiveness as educators had diminished over the years. Faculty awareness that students had changed over the years while instructional styles had remained constant is illustrated by the following teacher comment:

> Well, the kids were changing, their attitudes towards school were different; they were unmotivated. [There were many] absences, and kids not doing their work, poor attitudes about homework, and just the feeling of rush all the time. The kids come and they go and at the end of the day, you say "What have we accomplished?"

Communicating the need for change was a central step in getting teachers to think about the state of their current practice. Principals who were most effective in promoting the change to a block schedule did not begin with creating an awareness of block scheduling; rather they helped teachers create a personal awareness that instructional strategies needed to be altered. The awareness of the structural change, block scheduling, came after teachers saw they needed more than 45 minutes to use such techniques as collaborative learning groups, hands-on projects, and internet research.

In two school districts, however, an awareness that change was necessary was not presented on pedagogical grounds. An awareness that change was necessary arose because of rapid student growth and limited tax dollars being available to meet the needs of those students. Theses schools were actively focused on maintaining an existing level of organizational health by looking for new procedures which would enable them to distribute and use existing resources to manage the problem of excessive growth. In these geographical areas many families had moved from northern New Jersey and New York City, bringing with them great diversity which could not be overlooked. In districts that faced large enrollment increases, school boards and central office administrators agonized over how they would accommodate the influx of students. Not only did the number of students impact instruction, but the diversity of students needed to be considered. To enroll these students without placing more of a burden on the tax payers became a challenge. An awareness of these concerns developed among teachers closely followed by a suggestion that teachers look into block scheduling as a means of accommodating the numbers and the diversity of students entering their schools. Block scheduling, in these schools, was promoted as a framework that could be used to engage students in classroom activities, thereby helping students in the adjustment process to a new school. An awareness of other potential benefits, for example reducing the number of students teachers meet each day, was promoted so that teachers would be interested in gathering additional information about block scheduling.

Not all school districts, however, allowed time for teachers to become aware of the need for change. In three districts the decision to change to block scheduling preceded the teachers' recognition for a need to change. In these schools teachers did not feel that they had a voice in the decision and, consequently, they identified that morale of the staff was

low. Teachers interviewed in these high schools stated that neither they nor their principals could articulate the reasons for changing to a block schedule. The following teacher comment reflects many teachers' beliefs in these schools.

> Quite honestly, to this day I don't know why the district changed to block scheduling. Our students were doing well; they were accepted into the best colleges. Many of our graduates are professional people now.

Whether the teachers were subjective or objective in their comments on how they were led to awareness for change, inadequate communication influenced teacher perceptions of whether the implementation of block scheduling would be problematic or relatively problem free. Fullan (1982) explicitly states that "the extent to which proposals for change are defined according to one person's or one group's reality is the extent to which they will encounter problems in implementation (p. 29). Principals, who were most successful in implementing the change used continuous communication of goals and the research-based benefits of block scheduling to consciously lead staff to an awareness of the need for change. As a result, the principals experienced greater cooperation and their staffs suffered less stress in implementing block scheduling.

Awareness of a change is the first step in a concerns-based model of change. Effective principals communicated that a change in the status quo was needed and developed an awareness in their teachers that block scheduling is an alternative that may address those needs. The creation of an awareness that there is "something better out there" enabled teachers to move into the informational stage, a stage where teachers desire to learn more about the change.

Informational

The informational stage is a period of time when teachers are interested in learning more about the change. At this point in time the attitude of teachers can be characterized as curious, but "the person seems to be unworried about himself/herself in relation to the innovation" (Hall & Hord, 1987, p. 60). It is at this point that effective communication is essential.

Interviews with teachers indicated that information was presented in a variety of ways. In eleven of the schools, articles on block scheduling were shared with teachers by the principal. Each of these schools also provided opportunities for teachers to discuss the information, as a group, in faculty meetings or after school "think tank" sessions.

In the informational stage all schools either sent teachers on visits to block-scheduled schools or brought administrator/teacher teams from other school districts into the school to discuss how block scheduling worked in their schools. In a few schools, the principal also accompanied teachers to block-scheduled schools. In other schools, counselors visited schools. The presence of principals and counselors presented a symbolic message of support. Having information from teachers in blocked-scheduled schools was viewed as very important by all teachers, administrators and staff in the schools that were considering change. Follow-up discussions in the days immediately following these presentations and visits was essential to the change process. In schools where follow-up discussions were held to share information, an accurate synthesis of the information was developed and

shared; inaccuracies were set aside. In schools where follow-up opportunities for discussion were not provided, individual perceptions of teachers who made the visits or who were present at the on-site sessions became "fact." No opportunity was given to sort through differences in perception that teachers held following the presentations. As a result, comments which appeared to be more negative to the change surfaced in these buildings. For example, "cutting of staff may occur" and "we don't get nearly as much done as we used to" were themes that were commonly shared beliefs in two schools where adequate communication did not occur.

The information stage is an opportunity for principals to promote the change to a block schedule because teachers have not yet become concerned with how the change is going to affect them. Careful selection of articles and presenters that described both the advantages and challenges of block scheduling appeared to be more credible than information that simply presents "glowing advantages." It is the information that teachers gathered at this stage that generated the concerns that are present in the next stage of the model, the personal stage.

Personal

In the personal stage of change, an "individual is uncertain about the demands of the innovation, his/her inadequacy to meet those demands, and his/her role with the innovation" (Hall & Hord, 1987, p. 60). Since change often disrupts established patterns of teachers and creates conditions of uncertainty, it is important that teachers understand themselves and that principals understand what is happening to teachers (Fullan, 1982). When leaders are considering a change as complex as block scheduling, they need to recognize the extent that change will have on the personal and work lives of teachers, as well as the impact of change on teachers' relationships with their colleagues, family, and friends (Reddin, 1970).

The teachers in this study voiced their concerns about how the change would impact their lives in various ways. Three personal concerns seemed to predominate: time taken from the family to prepare to teach in the block schedule, time taken from leisure activities especially during the summer recess to collaborate with colleagues in curriculum revision, and the amount of stress they would be put under as they changed their teaching styles to accommodate the class schedule. The following comments illustrate these concerns of teachers.

> I know I shouldn't think this way, but will I have to work during the summer to prepare? What about my family plans for a vacation?
>
> We just can't walk into school in September and start teaching; we need to work together especially as a department. Where are we going to get time to get together?

Failure to acknowledge the personal costs of implementing any innovation may lead to increased amounts of stress on teachers who are faced with job as well as family responsibilities. Work concerns of subjects in this study included fear of losing professional credibility should they fail, questions over their ability to manage longer classes where they have spent 20 or more years in the traditional schedule, concern about

covering all the content they have been accustomed to covering in an academic year, and distress about loss of actual instructional time.

> I was worried that I would not be capable of managing a class for 90 minutes especially if the kids were trouble makers.
>
> The science department calculated that we would lose as many as 120 hours of instructional time. How are these kids ever going to be ready for college chemistry?

In nine of the school districts in this study, a major concern among teachers was that block scheduling would bring about a reduction in staff. In two cases, rumors about staff reduction almost killed serious consideration of implementing the change. One school administrator described how this personal concern was addressed in his school:

> There are always a lot of rumors about intensive scheduling: that is, if you go from a seven period day to a four by four block; the opportunity is there to do a reduction in force depending on your school district and depending on your contractual situation. But, the riffing [reduction in force] concern was addressed eventually by my asking the assistant superintendent at the time to come into a faculty meeting and to orally pledge that [staff reduction] was not the intent of either the district office or the school board.

Listening to teacher concerns about staff reduction and responding directly to those concerns were effective communication skills that enabled the previous school to effectively manage a problem, that decimated block-scheduling efforts in two other schools.

Personal concerns related to social or relational interactions with colleagues were present, but more subtly expressed. Although few teachers articulated clearly their concern about working well with colleagues in an interdependent manner, several expressed concerns about being tied down by other teachers' styles of teaching should they be asked to team teach a class or engage in integrated studies with another subject area teacher.

Personal concerns about relationships also included having time to socialize with each other. Under the traditional schedule, there are more opportunities for teachers to talk to colleagues in the hall because a break occurs every 45 minutes between classes. Block scheduling has a tendency to alter this aspect of school culture. For example, a school whose faculty members have a healthy camaraderie and many occasions to foster friendships may find that they will have fewer opportunities for interaction with colleagues. Conversely, the availability of longer blocks of concurrent planning time, which were available in 50% of the schools in the study, had the potential of moving teacher relationships from sporadic congenial interactions to extended interactions of professional collegiality.

In the teacher interviews the above-mentioned concerns were voiced by teachers and principals in all of the schools. The differing pedagogical expectations for teachers under the new schedule, coupled with their inability to foresee the impact of the schedule change on student achievement and acceptance, presented uncomfortable, and in some cases, intolerable stressful situations, even before the change was actually implemented. Individuals need to become proficient with instructional pedagogies that are compatible

with block scheduling and the structural characteristics of the organization (time for staff development) must change to accommodate the changes in individuals (Adams & Salvaterra, 1997).

Where change proceeded smoothly in the study schools, leaders consciously made an effort to understand what teachers were thinking. Wherever possible, principals in these schools allowed staff members to voice their concerns. Once the administrators knew and understood the personal concerns of teachers, they began to help teachers work through their personal concerns so that the focus was on managing their professional responsibilities. Providing forums, either individually or collectively, for teachers to express their concerns and reservations allowed principals to communicate factual information which in turn prevented the proliferation of rumors.

Management

In many ways the management stage is an extension of the personal stage. The management stage differs from the personal stage in that teachers are now more concerned with making the change work than with its effect on personal concerns. The role of the principal at this stage is connected to many of the characteristics of healthy organizations, including resource distribution and utilization, sharing authority for making decisions, and engaging in problem solving through adaptation and creation of strategies for working in the block-scheduled classroom.

The need for teachers to have some control over their work and work events is recognized as being a basic need of teachers (Nealiea, 1978; Sergiovanni, 1991; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1993). Principals who allowed teachers to make decisions that directly affected their instruction or other responsibilities when problems arose were more successful in getting teachers behind the change. For example, in one school with four period days, teachers had one non-instructional period. The non-instructional period was split into two parts, a forty-five minute planning time and a forty-five minute duty which was usually a study hall or cafeteria responsibility. When teachers approached the principal about taking "double duties" on one day so that on alternate days they could have a "double planning" time, the principal allowed the teachers to structure the duty schedule to meet their needs. In other schools principals took suggestions from teachers in deciding the model for intensive time scheduling, restructuring study halls, extra help periods, lunch schedules, library utilization, and passing time between classes.

The management stage also provided an opportunity for the principal to allocate resources to address needs of teachers. Allocation of resources included upgrading library informational sources due to the increased focus on research and individual projects, allocating money to support collaborative student projects, and shifting staff development moneys to address teacher training needs in cooperative learning, integrated learning, and technology workshops. The importance of other levels of leadership was also evident in the distribution of resources. In many cases extra staff development funds for teachers' visitations to other schools or for collaborative learning and other workshops was recommended by the superintendent and allocated by the school board. Teachers praised the resource supports discussed above, but also expressed extreme dissatisfaction when resources were not available. Libraries, particularly in the initial year, that did not have enough resources or time to accommodate project needs were an irritant. Teachers were

also particularly disturbed about promised resources that were not received. These resources included audiovisual equipment and time resources in the form of two teacher planning days between the first and second semesters. Failure to follow through on time resources created exceptional strain on teachers and "soured" many teachers toward the block schedule in its first year of implementation.

The management stage appeared to be a particularly critical stage in the sense that teachers were at the point where many of them were switching from a traditional time and instructional format where, in most cases, they felt they were successful, to a new time format requiring changes in instruction where their pedagogical abilities had not been tested. Sharing authority with teachers for the purpose of problem identification and management and targeting resources at perceived areas of need were key factors in smoothing the transition to a block schedule.

Consequence

Thomas Sergiovanni (1993) describes norms of professionalism that distinguish the professional from the person who simply performs the job adequately. One of these norms, a commitment to practice in an exemplary way, is the heart of the consequence stage (Sergiovanni, 1993, p. 48). In the consequence stage teachers evaluate how instruction affects student learning. In all of the block-scheduled schools student learning was expressed as a concern by a majority of teachers. Issues of knowledge retention from year to year, concept overload of students, student ability to focus in the longer periods, and the number of electives available to students under a block schedule were all concerns that related directly to student learning. Teachers entered the consequence stage at various times during the implementation process. For some teachers the advantages of longer periods in promoting collaborative learning, critical thinking, and disciplinary depth were obvious and they passed through this stage quickly; some teachers who were very strongly committed to the concept of block scheduling passed through this stage prior to beginning the block schedule, that is, the benefits to students were never questioned. Other teachers, for example, English teachers who were concerned about not being able to teach as many novels and chemistry teachers, who felt they lost overall instructional time under the block schedule, were still in the consequence stage even after teaching in the block for 3 or 4 years.

The role of a principal working with teachers in the consequence stage must vary according to how quickly teachers move through this stage. However, data collected from two schools showed that principals sometimes ignored these differences among teachers. In one school the principal was described as "writing off" teachers who did not fully support the block schedule after the middle of the second year. These "non-committed" teachers, who were marginalized from the mainstream, became active in their opposition to the block schedule and used every problem that arose within the school to discredit the block schedule. In another school a principal who had been very visible and actively supportive the first year, took a passively supportive role the second year and provided support only when asked for by the teachers. In this school teachers who were still in the consequence stage returned to very traditional lesson structures containing lecture, homework, and large group discussion classes, abandoning the collaborative learning and project activities of the previous year; the abandonment was justified in their minds because "traditional

scheduling" was how they perceived they could deliver the most effective instruction to students.

The pattern mentioned above was not unique; in the schools where block scheduling had been in place more than two years, principals reduced their activity directed at promoting the block schedule. In each of these schools there existed teachers who were not convinced that the block schedule was best for their students. As schools entered their third year of block scheduling there appeared to be a belief on the part of principals that teachers were committed to and proficient at teaching in a block schedule; however, teachers who were still working through the consequence stage were more likely than other teachers to regress toward using only traditional pedagogical techniques, that is, lecture, homework, and worksheets, within the longer blocks of time. Therefore the benefits of integrated learning, meeting the individual needs of students, engaging students in critical thinking, collaborative learning, and whole-task completion within the framework of a single period were not accruing to these teachers or their students. If principals wish to effectively implement block scheduling in their schools, it is important that principals continuously communicate the rationale supporting block scheduling, that is, block scheduling is an effective organizational strategy for promoting student learning. Through a continued focus on the positive outcomes for students and through supports mentioned in the management stage, principals will be more effective in moving teachers through the consequence stage to the point where they will show increased interest in collaborating with teachers to maximize learning opportunities for students.

Collaboration

In the collaboration stage "the focus is on coordination and cooperation with others regarding use of the innovation" (Hall & Hord, 1987, p. 60). Collaboration among teachers indicates that effective communication is occurring and that teachers are relying on each other for direction and leadership. When teachers reach this point in the implementation of a block schedule, a high level of commitment to the block schedule exists. The role of the principal now shifts from a provider of information and direct support to one of providing opportunities for teachers to collaborate to improve their instruction.

The creation of opportunities to collaborate is most visible in the area of scheduling; scheduling also appears to be the one principal's duty where criticism by teachers seems to be focused. The opportunity to engage in integrated and team teaching among colleagues, an advantage of block scheduling, focuses attention directly on the scheduling process within a school. In one school where integrated learning was promoted as an advantage of the block schedule, a social studies teacher and an English teacher were very pleased that their tenth grade classes were scheduled back to back. Because the two sections of students switched between the two teachers, "super blocks" of 180 minutes in length for the purpose of combining English literature and history could be created at the discretion of the teachers. This led to team teaching and also the performance of plays which illustrate cultural and historical facts of a particular time period. Each teacher described this arrangement as being highly motivating for them and their students; these teachers describe their pedagogical techniques as vastly improved and their willingness to put forth effort in the teaching act has increased dramatically.

The antithesis of the above is presented in the case of a math and a chemistry teacher who would like to have consecutive class periods and concurrent planning time so that they can integrate the teaching of math and chemistry with eleventh grade students. Integrated learning had been promoted as a goal within their school when block scheduling was first implemented; however, in the four years since block scheduling was implemented, the principal who promoted the change moved to another school district. With the move of the principal the promotion of the goals of block scheduling has faded to the point that one teacher expressed (and others concurred), "I can't even remember the original reasons why we went to block scheduling." Although the math teacher and science teacher had a strong desire to integrate their teaching, the principal has been unable to accommodate their scheduling needs. As a result, their enthusiasm toward attending workshops focusing on integrating math and science and their overall support of the block schedule has lessened.

The previous situations are indicative of the importance of making adaptations to solve problems, a key component of healthy schools. Scheduling of planning time and classes are two essential scheduling components that affect teachers' willingness to engage in collaborative activities such as integrated learning. Collaboration is an exciting stage for teachers because it is a time when collegiality and leadership among teachers are the key ingredients of instructional improvement. Principals who create opportunities for collaboration promote continuous improvement of teaching, the central feature of the refocusing stage.

Refocusing

Entrance into the refocusing stage means that teachers have accepted and are committed to the innovation. It is at this stage that exploration of additional benefits occurs and that replacement of the innovation by a more powerful alternative may occur (Hall & Hord, 1987). Although none of the schools as entities were completely within the refocusing stage, individual teachers who had maximized the benefits of block scheduling in their individual classrooms were squarely in the refocusing stage and are currently pursuing other opportunities created by the block schedule. Examples of these opportunities are illustrated by a math teacher who is developing an advanced calculus course for senior level students, an English teacher, who by way of distance learning, is able to teach a course in theater arts to students in 4 different school districts simultaneously, and a foreign language teacher who is using the internet to establish long distance connections in order to develop collaborative learning projects that are authentic instead of traditional textbook exercises. In each of the above cases the longer blocks of time coupled with the semester schedule have permitted teachers to pursue these initiatives.

The importance of recognizing teachers who have entered or not entered the refocusing stage is a critical feature of successfully implementing the block schedule. In one school, for example, block scheduling was implemented and most teachers were in the management stage where they were adapting lessons and pedagogical techniques to the longer blocks of time; however, before teachers were committed to or confident in their abilities to manage the block schedule, the school principal began encouraging them to engage in mastery learning where students were to demonstrate mastery before moving on to new material and that students were to be given multiple opportunities to demonstrate mastery if they failed a test or other evaluation the first time. The addition of a new innovation, mastery learning, when most teachers had not left the management stage for the original innovation, created

extreme stress on teachers which led them to reject not only the mastery learning initiative but also the block scheduling initiative which had already resulted in successes for many teachers. If most teachers had been at the refocusing stage for block scheduling, the principal would have had greater success in introducing a new initiative.

The refocusing stage is an important stage for teachers because confidence with the initial change exists at a high enough level that they can now take responsibility for new initiatives which are personally meaningful. Feelings of responsibility and meaningfulness which are gained by developing new initiatives, lead directly to higher levels of motivation and job satisfaction for teachers (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). Principals who are willing to empower teachers to support these initiatives, while providing supportive resources, are in a position to create schools which are continually improving.

Conclusion

A major emphasis of this paper is that change is an ongoing process as opposed to an event. Although change is often looked at from an organizational perspective, it is important for principals to recognize that the change process is different for every teacher. Teachers who are highly committed to a change may move very quickly to the refocusing stage while teachers who are more reluctant may languish for a long time in the personal or management stages of change. Effective implementation of change is also dependent upon a principal's ability to foster conditions characteristic of healthy schools. Continuous communication of goals and processing feedback from teachers for the purpose of identifying teacher needs as related to their present stage of concern is essential. Following the identification of needs, particularly in the personal and management stages, resources must be targeted and distributed among these needs so that maximum utilization of resources occurs. Effective principals are those who recognize where individual teachers are in the process of change and base their practice on the characteristics of healthy schools.

The change to a block schedule is, in many ways, a complex change. Teachers are being asked not only to restructure their lessons for longer blocks of time, but in many cases are also being asked to change from a traditional pattern of assigning readings, giving homework, and lecturing to collaborative learning and project-oriented activities which are more student-centered. The ability to create and use new strategies such as collaborative learning or adapt previously used techniques such as video technology, is central to healthy schools and essential for effective instruction to occur in a block schedule. If collaborative learning and authentic learning activities are part of a teacher's pedagogical repertoire, the change to a block schedule poses less of a threat because the longer blocks of time lend themselves to using those teaching strategies. These teachers, for whom the block schedule is a "natural fit," will rapidly pass to the later stages of the concerns-based change model. Teachers, for whom lecture is their primary pedagogical technique, will feel more threatened by the change to a block schedule. As a result, they will spend considerable time in the personal stage working through their individual concerns and spend a large amount of time in the management stage learning how to develop new pedagogical strategies and adapt old ones. It is at this point that collegial relationships, where power is vested in the hands of teachers who have moved on to the refocusing stage, are important in assisting other teachers work through the management and consequence stages of change. Where leadership is shared by teachers and principals, effective change is more likely to occur.

The keys to ensuring success for all teachers are (1) recognition of the stage of concern where teachers are in the change process and (2) the development of a school culture based on the characteristics of healthy schools. By following these two principles, school leaders will be better able to offer the supports necessary to maximize the benefits which are available through block scheduling.

References

Adams, D.C. & Salvaterra, M.E. (1997). Structural and teacher changes: Necessities for successful block scheduling. High School Journal, 81(2), 98-106.

Adams, D. C. & Salvaterra, M. E. (1997). Block scheduling: Pathways to success. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.

Canady, R. L. (1995). Block scheduling: A catalyst for change in high schools. Princeton, NJ: Eye on Education.

Carroll, J. M. (1994). The Copernican plan evaluated: The evolution of a Revolution. Topsfield, MA: Copernican Associates, Ltd.

Fullan, Michael. (1982). The meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Fuller, F. F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. American Educational Research Journal, 6(2), 207-226.

Hackman, J. R. & Oldham, G. R. (1980). Work redesign. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Hall, G. E. & Hord, S. M. (1987). Change in schools: Facilitating the process. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hanson, E. M. (1996). Educational administration and organizational behavior (4th). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Levine, D. & Cooper, E. (1989). The change process and its implications in teaching thinking. Dimensions of thinking and cognitive instruction. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Miles, M. (1965). Planned change and organizational health: Figure and ground. In Change processes in the public schools (pp. 18-21). Eugene, OR: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration.

Nealiea, L. (1978). Learned behavior: The key to understanding and preventing employee resistance to change. Group and organizational studies, 3(2), 211-223.

Reddin, W. J. (1970). Managerial effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Salvaterra, M. E., & Adams, D. C. (1995). Departing from tradition: Two schools' stories. Educational Leadership, 53(3), 32-35.

Salvaterra, M. & Adams, D.C. (1996). Teacher perceptions of intensive time scheduling in four high schools. American Secondary Education, 24(4), 23-29.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1991). The principalship: A reflective practice perspective (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Sergiovanni, T. J. & Starratt, R. J. (1993). Supervision: A redefinition. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.